REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed September 18, 2007. Claims 1-15 and 20-27 were rejected. Claims 1, 7-12, 20-21, and 23-27 have been amended. Claim 15 has been canceled. New claims 31 and 32 have been added. Reconsideration of the case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner noted that the specification lists trademarked items and that the items should be capitalized and accompanied by generic terminology. Applicant respectfully submits that trademarked items in the amended paragraphs of the specification are capitalized and accompanied by generic terminology, where appropriate, as far as Applicant is aware.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-15 and 20-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molinari (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058280 A1, hereinafter "Molinari") in view of Bowman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,726 B1, hereinafter "Bowman"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Amended claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

> automatically include the first parameter value in the first function call in the source code of the software program in response to the user input selecting the first parameter value, wherein automatically including the first parameter value in the first function call comprises automatically updating the displayed source code to display the first parameter value within the first function call, wherein automatically including the first parameter value in the first function call aids a user in editing the first function call.

Applicant respectfully submits that Molinari and Bowman, taken either singly or in combination, do not teach these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 1. The references do not teach automatically including a first parameter value in a first function call in the source code of a software program in response to user

input selecting the first parameter value. The references also do not teach automatically updating the displayed source code to display the first parameter value within the first function call. The references also do not teach aiding a user in editing the first function call, as recited in claim 1.

The references also do not teach displaying a graphical user interface for selecting a parameter value for the first parameter of the first function call. The references also do not teach that the graphical user interface for selecting the parameter value is displayed concurrently with the source code, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Molinari and Bowman do not teach the subject matter recited in claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Furthermore, as the Examiner is certainly aware, a valid 103(a) rejection requires the demonstration of a clear and particular teaching or suggestion found in the prior art to combine the references. The Examiner asserts that Bowman provides such a suggestion at Col. 2, line 66 – Col. 3, line 7. However, the cited portion of Bowman merely teaches the general concept of providing tools that facilitate the creation and editing of source code. This clearly does not amount to a clear and particular teaching or suggestion to combine Bowman with Molinari.

Futhermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Molinari actually teaches away from the combination with Bowman proposed by the Examiner.

With respect to the limitation of including the first parameter value in the source code of the software program, the Examiner cites:

> "Molinari, paragraph [0037] where [a]s the user places selected virtual instrument "panels" on the desktop and configures their properties…, an AIL file containing a description of the selected, created and defined aspects is simultaneously created, including, for each aspect, a description of its properties and connections [i.e., source code])."

However, regarding the AIL file, Molinari teaches at paragraph [0036] that:

> An important advantage of the present invention, and its use of "aspects" as software objects directly associated with executable code segments maintained in libraries, is that a measurement application created by a user of the invention may be fully represented in a brief text description of the chosen and configured aspects, and of their interconnections, **in lieu of pages of source code**. In particular, a user in creating an application program using the present invention, by using graphical tools to select and configure "panels" that

represent software aspects, is simultaneously caused to create such a text file as the run time and distributable representation of the user's application. In embodiments described in the present specification, the format selected to represent and comprise user-designed programs is termed Aspect Interaction Language (AIL), an expression selected to reflect **the nature of AIL as a form of program representation that is purely textual and descriptive, and that is not a programming language subject to being compiled into machine-executable code**. However other textual representations of aspects descriptions and interconnections could readily be employed, for example using XML representation.

Thus, Molinari explicitly teaches that an important advantage of the invention is that a measurement application created by a user of the invention may be fully represented in a brief text description of the chosen and configured aspects, and of their interconnections, **in lieu of pages of source code.** However, the combination of Bowman with Molinari would require the measurement application to be represented as source code, which would violate this principle of operation of Molinari's invention.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that even if Molinari and Bowman taught the limitations recited in claim 1 (which Applicant argues that they do not), they still would not be combinable to form a case of prima facie obviousness.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinct over Molinari and Bowman for at least the reasons set forth above. Inasmuch as the independent claims 24-27 recite similar limitations as those of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also patentably distinct over Molinari and Bowman, for reasons similar to those discussed above.

The new independent claim 31 recites in pertinent part:

> display a block diagram of a graphical program, wherein the block diagram includes a plurality of interconnected nodes visually indicating functionality of the graphical program, wherein the block diagram can be compiled into executable code, wherein the plurality of interconnected nodes includes a first node that takes a first input parameter;

Neither of the cited references teaches displaying a block diagram of a graphical program, as recited in claim 31. Claim 31 also recites in pertinent part:

automatically configure the first node with the first parameter value in response to the user input selecting the first parameter value, wherein automatically configuring the first node with the first parameter value comprises automatically updating the displayed block diagram to visually indicate that the first node receives the first parameter value as input.

The cited references also fail to teach these further limitations of claim 31. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is patentably distinct over Molinari and Bowman.

Since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct over Molinari and Bowman, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct, for at least this reason. Applicant also submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over Molinari and Bowman. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-77600/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

☐ Request for Continued Examination

☐ Terminal Disclaimer

☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers

☐ Notice of Change of Address

☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 2007-12-18 JCH/JLB